Concessional Business Valuation:

A CFO's Perspective on a Different Kind of Value

Executive Summary

Concession and PPP infrastructure assets demand a fundamentally different approach to valuation than conventional EPC businesses. This thought piece explains why standard corporate finance methodologies systematically mis-price long-duration infrastructure assets — and what CFOs can do about it.

The core distinction is structural: concession businesses generate contractually defined cash flows over 20–50 years from assets on their own balance sheet, not episodic project revenues. Valuation must reflect finite (not perpetual) cash flow horizons, embedded inflation linkages, regulatory frameworks, and the unique capital structures of project-financed infrastructure.

This piece presents a practitioner's framework covering: the concession agreement as foundational financial document; why terminal value is typically zero in Build-Operate-Transfer structures; Regulatory Asset Base (RAB) methodologies for utilities; and a valuation hierarchy spanning discounted cash flow over concession life, peer benchmarking (infrastructure concessions trade at 10–15× EV/EBITDA globally, with digital infrastructure at 12–18×), and M&A transaction multiples reflecting 20–40% control premiums.

Capital structure in concession finance is architectural, not transactional. The mechanics of non-recourse project finance, DFI/ECA tranches, Islamic finance instruments in MENA markets, and ESG credentials as measurable cost-of-capital levers are examined in detail.

For CFOs transitioning from contractor to infrastructure owner, the intellectual challenge is significant — different skillsets, longer time horizons, distinct systems, and investor communications are required. The piece provides an honest assessment of what this transition demands and why deliberate organizational investment is essential.

The conclusion contextualizes this within the current infrastructure cycle: GCC project awards exceeding $273 billion in 2024, expanding global PPP pipelines, and institutional

capital actively seeking inflation-protected, long-duration assets. CFOs who master concession valuation will capture disproportionate value from this decade.

Introduction: When Corporate Finance Meets Infrastructure Reality

There is a moment in every CFO's career when the familiar toolkit of corporate finance starts to feel inadequate — not wrong, exactly, but like trying to measure rainfall with a thermometer. For me, that moment arrived the first time I sat across the table from an infrastructure fund manager who dismissed our DCF model with quiet confidence and said, 'The concession life matters more than the terminal value.' He was right. And understanding why changed the way I think about value creation entirely.

This piece is my attempt to share that perspective, honestly and practically, for finance leaders who are navigating the shift from traditional construction or EPC contracting into the world of concessions, PPP structures, and long-duration infrastructure assets. It is a world where the rules of engagement are fundamentally different, and where the CFO's intellectual framework needs to evolve alongside the business.

1. The Fundamental Difference: Selling Time vs. Selling Output

In a conventional EPC or contracting business, value is relatively straightforward — you price a scope of work, build it within a defined margin, collect your receivables, and move to the next project. Revenue is episodic, margin is project-specific, and the balance sheet reflects the working capital cycle of a contractor. Valuation follows accordingly: EV/EBITDA multiples in the 4–7× range, P/E comparable, and a close watch on order book coverage.

A concession business operates on an entirely different logic. You are not selling a deliverable — you are selling availability, throughput, or a regulated service over a long, defined contractual period. Your revenue is a function of time and utilization, not

completion milestones. Your asset does not disappear from the balance sheet after handover; it becomes the engine of long-term cash generation. And your value, properly understood, is the discounted present worth of that engine operating reliably for twenty, thirty, or even fifty years.

This distinction shapes everything: how you structure project finance, how you negotiate tariff frameworks, how you model risk allocation between public and private parties, and ultimately, how you communicate value to investors, lenders, and boards. The CFO who internalises this shift early is the one who creates disproportionate value for the organisation — because most organisations undervalue what they own.

The table below crystallises the fundamental differences between these two business models:

Dimension	EPC / Contracting Business	Concession Business
Revenue Model	Episodic project completion	Long-term contracted cash flows (20–50 years)
Asset Ownership	Build and hand over to client	Build, own, and operate on own balance sheet
Risk Profile	Construction & performance risk	Demand/availability risk + long-term O&M risk
Time Horizon	1–5 years per project	25–50 years (full concession period)
Valuation Metrics	EV/EBITDA: 4–7×, P/E ratios, order book coverage	EV/EBITDA: 10–15×, DCF over concession life, NAV to RAB
Capital Structure	Corporate balance sheet leverage	Project finance (non-recourse/limited-recourse)
Cash Flow Characteristics	Working capital intensive, receivable-driven	Inflation-linked, predictable, annuity-like
Terminal Value in DCF	Often 60–80% of enterprise value	Typically zero (asset reverts at concession end)

Table 1: EPC vs Concession Business — Core Structural Differences

2. The Two Models of Concession Revenue — and Why They Value Differently

Before discussing valuation mechanics, it is worth being precise about the revenue architecture of a concession, because the two dominant models — demand-based and availability-based — produce fundamentally different risk and value profiles.

2.1 Demand-Based (User-Pay) Concessions

In a user-pay concession — toll roads, airports, ports — revenue is driven by actual utilisation. Traffic volumes, passenger throughput, and container movements determine your top line. The concession grants you the right to charge users directly, and the government typically steps back from the revenue risk. This is a genuinely commercial model, and it rewards the operator who can drive demand and manage capacity efficiently.

From a valuation standpoint, demand-based concessions require probabilistic demand modelling — traffic studies, passenger forecasts, and econometric models linking revenue to GDP, population growth, and modal shift. They trade at higher multiples when demand visibility is strong (mature toll roads with decades of traffic data) and at discounts when the demand story is nascent or uncertain (greenfield airports in frontier markets).

2.2 Availability-Based (Government-Pay) Concessions

In an availability-based PPP — hospitals, schools, prisons, government office buildings — the public authority pays you a periodic unitary charge for making the facility available to a defined standard of service, regardless of utilisation. You do not carry traffic risk or demand risk. You carry construction risk during the build phase and performance/availability risk during operations.

This model is, in financial terms, closer to a long-dated sovereign bond than to an equity investment in a commercial enterprise. The cash flows are highly predictable, the counterparty is government, and the primary risk is operational — your ability to maintain the asset to the required standard over a 25–30 year period. Accordingly, these assets trade at lower equity IRRs (6–7%) and are priced by institutional investors using

NAV relative to the present value of the contracted payment stream, not EV/EBITDA multiples.

Understanding which model your concession follows — or, increasingly, which blend of both — is the starting point for any intelligent valuation conversation. I have seen too many finance teams apply a single methodology indiscriminately and wonder why their valuation conclusion did not resonate with the market.

The comparison below highlights the critical differences between these two dominant concession frameworks:

Feature	Demand-Based (User-Pay)	Availability-Based (Government-Pay)
Revenue Driver	Actual usage/traffic (tolls, passenger volumes)	Facility availability to defined service standards
Who Pays	End users directly	Government (unitary charge)
Demand Risk	Borne by private operator	Borne by government
Examples	Toll roads, airports, ports, parking	Schools, hospitals, prisons, government buildings
Risk Profile	Medium to High (traffic/demand volatility)	Low (sovereign counterparty, operational only)
Equity IRR Range	7–12% (higher risk premium)	6–7% (bond-like returns)
Valuation Method	Probabilistic DCF with traffic scenarios	NAV relative to contracted payment stream
Investor Appeal	Growth-oriented infrastructure funds	Pension funds, insurance companies (income)

Table 2: Demand-Based vs Availability-Based Concession Models

3. The Architecture of Concession Value

Let me now be precise about the technical building blocks of concession valuation, because this is where the CFO earns their keep.

3.1 The Concession Agreement as the Source of Truth

Everything in a concession valuation flows from the concession agreement — its duration, its revenue mechanism, its tariff escalation provisions, its force majeure and termination clauses, and the conditions under which the asset reverts to the public authority. This is not a legal document that sits in a drawer. It is the foundational financial model of the business.

For a CFO, the critical habit is to read the concession agreement not as a lawyer but as a financial analyst. What is the real shape of the revenue curve over the concession life? What inflation linkage is embedded — CPI-linked, PPI-linked, or fixed escalation? What are the compensation mechanisms on early termination — do they protect your equity investment or merely cover outstanding debt? What capital expenditure obligations are triggered at defined intervals, and how are they funded? These questions, answered rigorously, form the skeleton of every subsequent financial analysis.

3.2 Terminal Value Is Not What You Think

This is perhaps the most important technical point I can make to a CFO trained in conventional corporate modelling: in a Build-Operate-Transfer concession, there is typically no terminal value — or more precisely, the terminal value is zero.

In a standard corporate DCF, terminal value often accounts for 60–80% of total enterprise value. In a concession DCF, the asset reverts to the government at the end of the contract period. The cash flows you are discounting are finite and contractually bounded. The model horizon is not a perpetuity growth rate assumption — it is the handback date. This is actually a feature, not a bug: it makes the valuation far more transparent and contractually anchored than most corporate valuations. But it requires the financial model to be meticulously constructed across the full concession life — with assumptions about long-term O&M costs, lifecycle replacement capex, periodic

regulatory resets, and refinancing risk all explicitly modelled rather than absorbed into a convenient terminal multiple.

3.3 The Regulatory Asset Base — An Alternative Anchor for Utility Concessions

For regulated utilities, power generation, water distribution, district cooling, transmission — there is a parallel valuation framework built around the Regulatory Asset Base (RAB). The RAB represents the value of the asset pool on which the regulator permits the company to earn a specified return. It is calculated dynamically as the opening RAB plus new capital expenditure, minus regulatory depreciation, typically adjusted for inflation.

RAB-based valuation produces a more stable and predictable anchor than market multiples, particularly during periods of market volatility. When a utility concession trades at a premium to RAB — as many regulated utilities in mature markets do — it signals that the market believes the allowed return exceeds the true cost of capital, or that the regulator is unlikely to fully reset returns at the next determination. For a CFO preparing for a capital raise or strategic transaction, knowing exactly where your asset sits relative to RAB gives you an independent and intellectually defensible reference point that is distinct from, and often more compelling than, a peer multiple analysis.

4. Valuation Methodologies — A Practitioner's Hierarchy

There is no single correct method for valuing concession assets. The discipline lies in triangulating between complementary approaches, understanding why each gives a different answer, and having the analytical confidence to explain that divergence to your board, your bankers, and your investors.

4.1 Discounted Cash Flow: The Foundation

The concession-period DCF is the primary and most intellectually honest tool. But it differs from a standard corporate DCF in several important ways:

- **Finite horizon:** Cash flows are modelled to the contractual handback date, not in perpetuity. Every year of the model matters.
- **Inflation linkage:** CPI-linked revenue is a genuine economic attribute that must be reflected in the discount rate. You cannot discount real cash flows at a nominal WACC without introducing a systematic valuation error.
- **Debt sculpting:** Project debt is structured around the cash flow profile of the asset, not a standard amortisation schedule. Debt Service Cover Ratios (DSCR) — typically 1.20–1.40× in infrastructure — are the operating constraint, and equity IRR is derived as a residual of the financing architecture.
- **Risk-adjusted discount rate:** OECD peer discount rates cannot be applied without adjustment to concession assets in emerging or frontier markets. Regulatory maturity, political risk, liquidity conditions, and currency exposure all warrant incremental premium — typically 100–200 basis points for MENA markets relative to Western European peers.
- **Lifecycle capex:** Major maintenance and asset replacement events over a 30-year period are material and must be explicitly modelled, not estimated as a percentage of revenue. Skimping on this analysis is a common source of CFO embarrassment when the model is stress-tested.

4.2 Trading Multiples: Benchmarking Against the Market

EV/EBITDA multiples provide the most immediate cross-check against comparable listed companies. The table below summarises where global concession and infrastructure asset classes currently trade, with implications for MENA-positioned assets:

Asset Class	EV/EBITDA (x)	Equity IRR	Tenor	Risk Profile
Regulated Utilities	9 – 13×	5 – 7%	20 – 30 yrs	Low
Toll Roads	10 – 14×	7 – 10%	25 – 35 yrs	Low-Med
Airports	9.5× listed / 19× private	7 – 9%	30 – 50 yrs	Medium
Ports & Logistics	8 – 12×	8 – 12%	20 – 30 yrs	Medium
IWPP / Desalination	9 – 12×	7 – 11%	25 – 35 yrs	Low-Med
PPP / Social Infra	NAV ±1.0×	6 – 7%	25 – 30 yrs	Low
Digital Infra (Fibre/DC/Towers)	12 – 18×	8 – 14%	15 – 25 yrs	Med-High
GCC / MENA Benchmark	10 – 13×	7 – 9%	20 – 35 yrs	Low-Med

Table 3: Global Infrastructure & Concession Asset Classes — Valuation Benchmarks (2025)

Two observations from this data deserve deliberate attention. First, the spread between listed and private market valuations for airports — approximately 9.5× versus 19× EV/EBITDA — reflects the scarcity premium that sovereign wealth funds, pension funds, and unlisted infrastructure managers are willing to pay for high-quality, long-duration, inflation-protected assets. This is not irrational exuberance; it reflects the genuine structural advantage of private infrastructure — no market volatility, no quarterly earnings pressure, and a captive asset that cannot be replicated by a competitor. Second, the emergence of digital infrastructure at the top of the multiple range demonstrates that the traditional distinction between 'hard' and 'soft' infrastructure is blurring. Cell towers, data centres, and fibre networks exhibit the same contractual and cash flow characteristics as physical infrastructure — and markets are valuing them accordingly.

To bring this benchmarking analysis closer to real-world comparables, the table below presents the current EV/EBITDA multiples for six leading global concession and infrastructure companies — spanning toll roads, airports, transport, PPP funds, utilities, and digital infrastructure. These are the peers that institutional investors and equity analysts use to price infrastructure portfolios, and they provide a concrete reference point for any CFO preparing a concession business for capital markets engagement.

Company	EV/EBITDA (×)
VINCI (Toll & Airports)	12.5
Ferrovial (Infrastructure / Transport)	13.0
BBGI / HICL (PPP Funds)	10.0
TAQA (Utilities)	11.0
Marafiq / ACWA (IWPP)	10.5
DigitalBridge (Data Infrastructure)	15.0

Table 4: Global Concession Peers — EV/EBITDA Multiples (2025)

The median multiple of 11.7× provides a defensible anchor for pricing a well-structured concession portfolio with comparable contract tenors, counterparty quality, and inflation

protection. The range — from 10.0× for pure-play PPP funds to 15.0× for digital infrastructure — reflects the market's assessment of growth optionality, operational leverage, and the scarcity value of the underlying assets. For a CFO articulating the investment case for a diversified infrastructure business, these are not abstract benchmarks. They are the valuation language that institutional capital understands and prices.

4.3 Transaction Multiples and Control Premiums

When a concession asset changes hands in an M&A transaction, it typically commands a control premium of 20–40% above the prevailing trading multiple. This premium is not simply 'goodwill' — it has a precise economic logic. The acquirer expects to optimise the capital structure (refinancing at lower spreads under new ownership), drive operational efficiencies that are only available to the controlling party, and potentially extend the concession term through negotiation with the public authority.

For a CFO preparing for an IPO of a concession business, the transaction multiple universe is arguably the most relevant reference point — because IPO pricing reflects what a sophisticated buyer would pay for a large minority stake in a business that retains private market characteristics. Getting this framing right, and presenting it credibly to bookrunners and anchor investors, is one of the most consequential analytical tasks a CFO will undertake.

5. Capital Structure in Concession Finance — It Must Be Architected, Not Just Funded

One of the most consequential decisions a CFO makes in a concession business is capital structure design. Unlike a corporate balance sheet, where leverage decisions are governed by credit rating targets and covenant headroom, concession capital structure is engineered at the project level — often with non-recourse or limited-recourse debt. The implications for risk management and equity returns are profound.

Project finance — the dominant funding mechanism for large-scale concessions globally — separates the credit risk of the project from the balance sheet strength of the sponsor.

Lenders take security over the project assets, the concession agreement itself, the project's bank accounts, and the shares of the project company. They look to the cash flows of the project for repayment, not to the sponsor's consolidated balance sheet. This means the project must stand alone on the strength of its contractual architecture — which is precisely why the quality of the concession agreement, the off-take contract, and the demand model are so critical to financing terms.

Optimising a concession capital structure requires the CFO to engage simultaneously with multiple financing layers: senior project debt from commercial banks and capital markets, mezzanine or subordinated facilities for structural enhancement, DFI and Export Credit Agency tranches which often provide longer tenors and more competitive all-in pricing than commercial alternatives, equity from the sponsor and potentially institutional co-investors, and — with increasing importance — sustainability-linked instruments where the pricing grid is tied to measurable ESG milestones.

The typical capital structure architecture for a large-scale infrastructure concession is illustrated below:

Layer	Source	Typical Cost	Strategic Value
Senior Debt	Commercial banks, bond markets	Benchmark + 150–300bps	Largest quantum; lowest cost
DFI / ECA Debt	IFC, EBRD, ADB, ECAs	Benchmark + 100–250bps	Longer tenor (15–20yrs); lower spreads
Mezzanine / Sub-Debt	Infrastructure debt funds	8–12%	Fills financing gap; enhances gearing
Equity	Sponsor, co-investors, infra funds	Target IRR: 10–15%	Risk capital; upside participation
Islamic Finance	Sukuk, Murabaha, Ijara	Benchmark + 150–300bps	Access to regional liquidity (GCC/MENA)
Green / ESG Debt	Green bonds, sustainability loans	Benchmark + 120–280bps	20–30bps pricing benefit; ESG investor base

Table 5: Concession Capital Structure — Financing Layers and Strategic Value

For concession businesses operating in the GCC and broader MENA region, an additional and often underappreciated dimension is the availability of Islamic finance structures — Sukuk issuances, Murabaha facilities, Ijara structures — which tap a distinct regional

liquidity pool and investor base. These instruments are not merely Sharia-compliant alternatives to conventional debt; they are access to a genuinely different source of long-term capital that can reduce the overall cost of funding when used intelligently in the financing mix.

6. The ESG Dimension — It Is Already in the Price

I want to address ESG not as a compliance exercise, but as a hard financial variable — because that is precisely what it has become in the infrastructure investing universe.

The dominant buyers of concession and infrastructure assets today are pension funds, sovereign wealth funds, and insurance companies. These institutions manage long-duration liabilities on behalf of millions of beneficiaries, and they operate under explicit ESG investment mandates that are not optional — they are legally embedded in their investment policies. When they evaluate a concession asset, they are asking two questions simultaneously: 'What is the risk-adjusted IRR?' and 'Does this asset pass our ESG screen?' A business that cannot answer the second question confidently will either be excluded from their investment universe entirely or will face a wider discount rate and a smaller pool of competing bidders — both of which directly reduce valuation.

The practical implication for a CFO is straightforward: ESG integration is a cost-of-capital management tool. Concession businesses with credible carbon reduction pathways, measurable social impact programmes, transparent governance structures, and verifiable ESG reporting can access green financing, sustainability-linked loans, and climate infrastructure funds — all at spreads that are meaningfully lower than conventional alternatives. Over a 25-year concession life, even a 20–30 basis point reduction in the all-in cost of debt translates into a material increase in equity NAV.

The CFO who treats ESG as a reporting obligation has misunderstood the economics. The CFO who treats it as a capital markets strategy is creating value.

7. The Transition from Contractor to Infrastructure Owner — An Honest Assessment

I want to be direct about something that does not receive enough candid attention in the literature: the transition from running the finances of a construction or EPC business to leading the finance function of an integrated infrastructure group with long-duration concession assets is a genuinely difficult cognitive and organisational shift. Not every CFO makes it successfully, and not every finance team is equipped for it without deliberate investment.

The challenge is not technical competence — most experienced finance leaders can learn the DCF mechanics of project finance. The challenge is conceptual re-orientation. In contracting, the CFO's primary measures are working capital management, project margin analysis, receivables ageing, claims provisioning, and order book coverage. Time horizons are quarterly and annual. In a concession business, the primary measures are portfolio NAV, concession-weighted average life, regulatory asset base, equity IRR to handback, and DSCR headroom. Time horizons are decadal. These are not incremental extensions of the same analytical framework — they are genuinely different disciplines, and the CFO who conflates them will produce analysis that is either naively optimistic or systemically conservative.

Organisations that navigate this transition successfully tend to make several deliberate investments. They build financial systems capable of managing both the project-by-project accounting of contracting operations and the long-dated amortisation and regulatory accounting requirements of concession assets — which demands a level of ERP sophistication that most pure contractors have not needed. They develop treasury functions capable of managing multi-currency, multi-tenor exposures across a portfolio of projects in different jurisdictions and regulatory environments. And they build investor relations capabilities — not just reporting teams — that can articulate a sum-of-the-parts valuation thesis to institutional audiences who may be encountering the business for the first time.

None of this happens automatically. It requires a CFO who sees the finance function not as a cost centre or a compliance function, but as a strategic capability that determines how much of the value the business creates is actually realised by its shareholders.

8. Communicating Concession Value to the Market — The CFO as Architect of the Investment Narrative

There is one more dimension of concession valuation that belongs in any honest CFO perspective, and it is one that goes beyond financial modelling: the market does not automatically see value that you have not explicitly shown it.

Infrastructure and concession businesses frequently trade at discounts to intrinsic value — particularly when they operate in markets that are less familiar to international institutional capital. The cash flows are long and the models are complex. The regulatory frameworks may be less well understood outside the home market. The asset-level disclosure may be incomplete. And the comparables are drawn from geographies with different risk profiles. Each of these is a potential discount factor.

A sophisticated CFO's job is to turn each of these potential discounts into a premium argument. The length of cash flows becomes duration certainty and inflation protection. The regulatory framework becomes sovereign counterparty quality. The market context becomes supply-demand scarcity and growth optionality. The peer group is not chosen passively — it is selected deliberately to benchmark the business against the comparables that make the valuation case most compellingly.

When a regional infrastructure portfolio is properly benchmarked against VINCI, Ferrovial, TAQA, or HICL Infrastructure — all of which trade in the 10–15× EV/EBITDA range — the implied valuation for a comparably structured concession portfolio in a high-growth emerging market becomes both quantifiable and credible to institutional audiences. The CFO does not assert that valuation. The CFO builds the financial architecture, the disclosure standard, and the investor narrative that justify it — and then lets the market do the pricing.

9. Why This Matters Now — The Infrastructure Decade

We are entering what many in the capital markets are beginning to call the 'infrastructure decade.' The global stock of ageing infrastructure requires trillions in replacement and modernisation investment. The energy transition demands a wholesale reconfiguration of power generation, transmission, and storage infrastructure. Digital infrastructure — data centres, fibre networks, cell towers — is becoming as foundational as roads and bridges. And governments across every region, constrained by fiscal deficits and the need for private capital, are actively expanding PPP and concession frameworks to bring private sector expertise and balance sheets into public infrastructure.

In the MENA region specifically, the momentum is extraordinary. New project awards across the GCC reached a record $273 billion in 2024. Qatar's infrastructure programme, Saudi Arabia's transformation agenda, the UAE's continuous urban and digital investment — these represent a structural and durable pipeline of concession and PPP opportunities that will reward the organisations that understand not just how to build infrastructure, but how to own it, finance it, and value it.

For CFOs operating in this environment, the intellectual investment in understanding concession valuation is not optional or academic. It is the prerequisite for doing the job well. The organisations that will generate the most value from this cycle are those whose finance leaders can close the gap between what an infrastructure asset is genuinely worth and what the market is currently willing to pay for it — and do so with the rigour, the credibility, and the conviction to bring others along.

That is the CFO's frontier in the infrastructure business. It is demanding, technically rigorous, and genuinely consequential. In thirty years across construction, energy, and concession finance, I have yet to find more intellectually satisfying work.

Conclusion

Concession businesses are not valued like conventional corporates — and CFOs who approach them with standard corporate finance instincts will systematically misprice the asset. The error can run to hundreds of millions in enterprise value for a large portfolio.

The valuation methodologies presented here — concession-period DCF, peer benchmarking at 10–15× EV/EBITDA, and M&A transaction multiples reflecting 20–40% control premiums — are not aspirational. They are market reality for high-quality infrastructure assets. The CFO's job is to build the financial architecture, governance transparency, ESG credentials, and investor narrative that allow the market to see and price that reality.

For organizations transitioning from construction contractor to infrastructure owner, the finance function is not a support service — it is the critical enabler of value realisation. The systems, capital structures, investor relationships, and financial story you build will determine whether the business captures 60% or 100% of the value it creates.

We are at the beginning of an infrastructure supercycle. Institutional investors need inflation-protected, long-duration assets. The CFOs who master the financial language of this asset class will define the next generation of infrastructure champions.

Sources & References

The following sources informed the research, data, and benchmarks referenced throughout this piece:

- **ClearBridge Investments** *(2024)* Valuation of Infrastructure Assets — Q3 2024
- **Statista** *(2024)* EV/EBITDA in the Energy & Environmental Services Sector in the United States
- **Statista** *(2024)* EV/EBITDA in the Transportation and Logistics Sector in the United States
- **Brookfield Public Securities Group** *(2024)* The Attractive Opportunity Today in Infrastructure Equities
- **RWorld Bank Group — PPP Knowledge Lab** *(2023)* Finance Structures for PPP — Non-Recourse and Limited-Recourse Project Finance
- **World Bank Group — PPP Knowledge Lab** *(2023)* Project Finance — Key Concepts in Public Private Partnerships
- **APMG Public-Private Partnerships Certification Program** *(2022)* Private Finance and Project Finance — PPP Certification Guide, Section 7.1
- **U.S. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)** *(2022)* Financial Structuring of Public-Private Partnership (P3) Concessions
- **IFM Investors** *(2022)* Integrating ESG Analysis into Infrastructure Debt Investments
- **Global Infrastructure Investor Association (GIIA) & Realfin** *(2025)* Global Infrastructure ESG Report 2024 — ESG Fundraising Reaches Record Highs
- **GIH Infrastructure Monitor — Global Infrastructure Hub** *(2024)* Infrastructure Monitor 2024 — Global Trends in Private Investment in Infrastructure
- **MEED** *(2025)* GCC Construction Industry Evolves — Total Value of Construction Project Contract Awards 2024
- **AECOM** *(2025)* Middle East Property and Construction Handbook — MENA Economic Review 2025
- **King & Spalding** *(2025)* Outlook and Opportunities in GCC Projects into 2026 and Beyond — PPP Adoption and Pipeline
- **Mordor Intelligence** *(2025)* GCC Infrastructure Market Size, Share and Growth Trends to 2030
- **EBRD** *(2022)* PPP Regulatory Guidelines — Regional Study on Financing Models for Public-Private Partnerships in EBRD Economies, Volume III

About the Author

Kailash Sadangi

Kailash Sadangi is one of the research contributor of Ignadas. His work spans financial strategy, concessional business modelling, and value advisory for infrastructure and public-private partnership engagements across emerging markets. The views and analysis presented in this document reflect his independent professional perspective and do not constitute formal financial, legal, or investment advice. Readers are encouraged to seek independent counsel before making decisions based on the content herein.